

Electronic Copy of
EPA Related Excerpts from
SENATE REPORT #105-53
on

FY 1998 Appropriations Bill for EPA (and VA, etc.)

*(For Internet links to a complete copy of the Report and related information
(i.e. House Report 105-175, H.R.2158, S.1034), refer to the NCEA Homepage
(<http://www.epa.gov/ncea>) under the Links section.)*

TOPIC INDEX

	Page No.
Summary of the Bill	3
Summary of Budget Estimates and Amounts Recommended in Bill	4
Fiscal Year 1998 Rationale	4
Reprogramming Authority	6
Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)	7
 EPA Sections of the Report	
	8
Summary	8
Budget Agreement	10
Reprogramming Authority	10
 Science and Technology	11
\$8M for PM Research at University-based Research Centers	11
Congressional Add-ons	12
Congressional Reductions	12
EMPACT	13
PM Research and the National Academy of Sciences	13
Other Congressional Directives	13
Peer Review	14
 Environmental Programs and Management	16
Congressional Add-ons	16
Congressional Reductions	19
Other Congressional Directives	19
 Office of the Inspector General	24
 Buildings and Facilities	25
 Hazardous Substances (Superfund)	26
 Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	28
 Oil Spill Response	30
 State and Tribal Assistance Grants	31
 Working Capital Fund	34

Other Related Agencies

Office of Science and Technology Policy	34
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	35
General Provisions (Partial)	36
Comparative Statement of New Budget Authority	38

- Notes:**
- Non-EPA sections of the Report are deleted from this electronic copy of the Report, except for relevant excerpts from the Summary, OSTP, Council on Environmental Quality, and General Provisions sections of the Report. This electronic copy was derived from the Report as shown on the Congressional Internet site, Thomas.
 - Page numbers referred to in the topic index and as shown below have been added to this electronic copy for the convenience of the reader. The page numbers in this document do not correspond with the page numbers referred to in the Congressional record version of the Report or to the page numbers in the actual published Committee Report document.
 - Bolding has also been added to highlight various items of interest.

42 229 cc

Calendar No. 118

105 th Congress

Report

SENATE

1st Session

105 53

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT, AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998

July 17, 1997.--Ordered to be printed

Mr. Bond, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following
REPORT

[To accompany S. 1034]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1034) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount of new budget (obligational) authority

Amount of bill as reported to Senate	\$90,901,535,000
Amount of appropriations to date, 1997	82,063,403,442
Amount of budget estimates, 1998	90,972,438,000
Under estimates for 1998	70,903,000
Above appropriations for 1997	8,917,820,560

INTRODUCTION

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

As recommended by the Committee, this bill attempts to provide a fair and balanced approach to the many competing programs and activities under the VA HUD subcommittee's jurisdiction, within the constraints imposed by a very tight budget allocation, including constraints dictated by the budget agreement designed to result in a unified Federal budget in fiscal year 2002.

The Committee recommendation provides \$18,766,266,000 in discretionary funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, including an increase in funding for VA medical care, research, and the State home program. The Committee's recommendation for VA represents an increase of \$92,920,000 above the President's request. Despite a proposed reduction of almost \$300,000,000 in VA discretionary spending in the budget agreement, VA medical programs were afforded the highest priority in order to ensure quality care to all veterans currently being served by the VA and to ensure a smooth transition to the new organizational structure and its emphasis on managed care.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Committee's recommendation totals \$25,505,255,000, and continues policy and programmatic reforms enacted last year. The Committee strongly supports enactment of comprehensive reform legislation under the jurisdiction of the authorizing committee, including an overhaul of the public and assisted housing programs as well as other program, management, and fiscal reforms designed to address the many and substantial program and

administrative deficiencies facing the Department. This appropriations bill, however, contains temporary extensions of provisions needed to halt the ever-increasing cost of housing subsidy commitments.

In addition, this appropriations bill includes the multifamily housing restructuring proposals now under consideration by the authorizing committee as part of the reconciliation process. The excessive section 8 subsidies necessary to sustain this inventory of nearly 1 million units of low-income housing cannot be continued within the constraints of a balanced budget plan for discretionary spending. Unless Congress acts to provide a process to deal with the excessive debt of this housing inventory, there could be massive defaults and substantial resident displacement.

The Committee-reported bill also restores funding for the Community Development Block Grants Program [CDBG] at the full current fiscal year 1997 funding level of \$4,600,000,000, and restores full funding to elderly and disabled housing (\$365,000,000 over the President's request). In addition, the HOME program is also maintained at its current \$1,400,000,000 level.

For the Environmental Protection Agency, the Committee recommendation totals \$6,975,920,000, an increase of \$176,527,000 over the current fiscal year, with increases in such areas as State revolving funds. While the Committee's recommendation represents a significant increase over the enacted level for EPA's operating programs, the President's full request was not possible owing to the constraints imposed by the 602(b) allocation and the necessity of adequately funding veterans medical care. In addition, overriding policy concerns coupled with budget constraints prevented the Committee from recommending an increase for Superfund.

The Committee's recommendation does not include any so-called riders for EPA in order to minimize the potential for controversy or extended disputes.

The bill provides the President's full request of \$788,588,000 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Committee continues to have grave concerns with the skyrocketing costs of FEMA's disaster relief program--for which more than \$10,000,000,000 has been appropriated in fiscal years 1995-97--as well as FEMA's stewardship of this multibillion-dollar program. Therefore, a limitation on spending has been included in the "Disaster relief" account, consistent with FEMA's recent legislative proposal, as a first step to reforming the disaster relief program.

The Committee recommendation for National Aeronautics and Space Administration totals \$13,500,000,000, the same as the President's request. The Committee recommends full funding for the Mission to Planet

Earth Program. For the National Science Foundation, the Committee recommends \$3,377,000,000. While a modest increase of \$107,000,000 over the 1997 level, it does reflect the Committee's commitment to support of high-priority basic research and technology development activities, notwithstanding our growing budgetary constraints.

REPROGRAMMING AND INITIATION OF NEW PROGRAMS

The Committee continues to have a particular interest in being informed of reprogrammings which, although they may not change either the total amount available in an account or any of the purposes for which the appropriation is legally available, represent a significant departure from budget plans presented to the Committee in an agency's budget justifications.

Consequently, the Committee directs the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and the agencies funded through this bill, to notify the chairman of the Committee prior to each reprogramming of funds in excess of \$250,000 between programs, activities, or elements unless an alternate amount for the agency or department in question is specified elsewhere in this report. The Committee desires to be notified of reprogramming actions which involve less than the above-mentioned amounts if such actions would have the effect of changing an agency's funding requirements in future years or if programs or projects specifically cited in the Committee's reports are affected. Finally, the Committee wishes to be consulted regarding reorganizations of offices, programs, and activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations.

Further, the Committee expects each department and agency within the jurisdiction of the VA HUD Appropriations Subcommittee to meet fully the requirements, including all consultations and reporting requirements, of the Government Performance and Results Act. This process is critical to a successful dialog between the Congress and the executive branch on the funding and implementation of all Federal agencies, programs, and activities.

The Committee also expects that the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, as well as the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission, will submit operating plans, signed by the respective secretary, administrator, or agency head, for the Committee's approval within 30 days of the bill's enactment. Other agencies within the bill should continue to submit them consistent with prior year

policy.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

The Committee urges each agency and department to comply with both the spirit and the letter of the law of the Government Performance and Results Act [Results Act]. The Results Act is intended to rationalize the agency budget process by requiring each agency and department to develop a strategic plan, including a comprehensive mission statement based on the agency's statutory authority, a set of outcome-related strategic goals, and a description on how the agency will accomplish these goals. Nevertheless, certain deadlines of the Results Act are rapidly approaching. For example, each Federal agency must develop a strategic plan that covers at least 5 years and must submit the plan to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget no later than September 30, 1997.

The Committee remains concerned over the status of the strategic plans of most of the agencies covered by the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee. While NASA has made real progress in developing its strategic plan, most of the other agencies have had mixed success. The Committee advises that it takes the requirements of the Results Act very seriously, including the requirement to consult with Congress, and expects each agency and department fully to meet all requirements of the Results Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Appropriations, 1997	\$6,799,393,000
Budget estimate, 1998	7,645,493,000
Committee recommendation	6,975,920,000

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] was created through Executive Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970 designed to consolidate certain Federal Government environmental activities into a single agency. The plan was submitted by the President to the Congress on July 8, 1970, and the Agency was established as an independent agency in the executive branch on December 2, 1970, by consolidating 15 components from 5 departments and independent agencies.

A description of EPA's pollution control programs by media follows:

Air.-- The Clean Air Act Amendments [CAA] of 1990 authorize a national program of air pollution research, regulation, prevention, and enforcement activities.

Water quality.-- The Clean Water Act [CWA], as amended in 1977, 1981, and 1987, provides the framework for protection of the Nation's surface waters. The law recognizes that it is the primary responsibility of the States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate water pollution. The States determine the desired uses for their waters, set standards, identify current uses and, where uses are being impaired or threatened, develop plans for the protection or restoration of the designated use. They implement the plans through control programs such as permitting and enforcement, construction of municipal waste water treatment works, and nonpoint source control practices. The CWA also regulates discharge of dredge or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands.

Drinking water.-- The Safe Drinking Water Act [SDWA] of 1974, as amended in 1996, charges EPA with the responsibility of implementing a program to assure that the Nation's public drinking water supplies are free of contamination that may pose a human health risk, and to protect and prevent the endangerment of ground water resources which serve as

drinking water supplies.

Hazardous waste.-- The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 [RCRA] mandated EPA to develop a regulatory program to protect human health and the environment from improper hazardous waste disposal practices. The RCRA Program manages hazardous wastes from generation through disposal.

EPA's responsibilities and authorities to manage hazardous waste were greatly expanded under the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984. Not only did the regulated universe of wastes and facilities dealing with hazardous waste increase significantly, but past mismanagement practices, in particular prior releases at inactive hazardous and solid waste management units, were to be identified and corrective action taken. The 1984 amendments also authorized a regulatory and implementation program directed to owners and operators of underground storage tanks.

Pesticides.-- The objective of the Pesticide Program is to protect the public health and the environment from unreasonable risks while permitting the use of necessary pest control approaches. This objective is pursued by EPA under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act [FIFRA] and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act [FFDCA] through three principal means: (1) review of existing and new pesticide products; (2) enforcement of pesticide use rules; and (3) research and development to reinforce the ability to evaluate the risks and benefits of pesticides.

Radiation.-- The radiation program's major emphasis is to minimize the exposure of persons to ionizing radiation, whether from naturally occurring sources, from medical or industrial applications, nuclear power sources, or weapons development.

Toxic substances.-- The Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA] establishes a program to stimulate the development of adequate data on the effects of chemical substances on health and the environment, and institute control action for those chemicals which present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. The act's coverage affects more than 60,000 chemicals currently in commerce, and all new chemicals.

Multimedia.--Multimedia activities are designed to support programs where the problems, tools, and results are cross media and must be integrated to effect results. This integrated program encompasses the Agency's research, enforcement, and abatement activities.

Superfund.-- The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 [CERCLA] established a national program to protect public health and the environment from the threats posed by inactive hazardous waste sites and uncontrolled spills of hazardous

substances. The original statute was amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 [SARA]. Under these authorities, EPA manages a hazardous waste site cleanup program including emergency response and long-term remediation.

Leaking underground storage tanks.-- The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 [SARA] established the leaking underground storage tank [LUST] trust fund to conduct corrective actions for releases from leaking underground storage tanks that contain petroleum or other hazardous substances. EPA implements the LUST response program primarily through cooperative agreements with the States.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$6,975,920,000 for EPA. This is a decrease of \$669,573,000 below the budget request and an increase of \$176,527,000 above the current budget.

With the exception of funding for Superfund, the total amount recommended for EPA comes close to that suggested by the budget agreement. Significant increases are recommended in the areas of particulate matter research and monitoring, implementation activities associated with the new food quality and safe drinking water laws, leaking underground storage tank grants, State and tribal environmental assistance grants, and State revolving loan funds. Given that the Superfund Program remains a troubled program badly in need of reform and reauthorization, coupled with the constraints imposed by the budget allocation, justification could not be made to increase significantly funding for the Superfund Program.

The agency is directed to notify the Committee prior to each reprogramming in excess of \$500,000 between programs and activities, when those reprogrammings are for different purposes. The exceptions to this limitation are as follows: (1) for the "Environmental programs and management" account, Committee approval is required only above \$1,000,000; and (2) for the "State and tribal assistance grants" account, reprogramming of performance partnership grant funds is exempt from this limitation.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriations, 1997\1\	\$552,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998\1\	614,269,400
Committee recommendation\1\	600,000,000

\1\Does not include transfer from Superfund account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

EPA's "Science and technology" account provides funding for the scientific knowledge and tools necessary to support decisions on preventing, regulating, and abating environmental pollution and to advance the base of understanding on environmental sciences. These efforts are conducted through contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements with universities, industries, other private commercial firms, nonprofit organizations, State and local government, and Federal agencies, as well as through work performed at EPA's laboratories and various field stations and field offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$600,000,000 for science and technology, an increase of \$48,000,000 over the enacted level, and a decrease of \$14,269,400 below the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends the transfer of \$35,000,000 from the Superfund account, for a total of \$635,000,000 for science and technology.

The Committee has made the following changes to the budget request:

+\$8,000,000 for a comprehensive extramural research initiative on particulate matter [PM], in addition to the \$26,600,000 in the budget request for PM research. The funds provided are to be used to create up to five university-based research centers selected through a competitive peer review process. The centers program should seek to address the most pressing unanswered questions involved in the air particulates field. A governing criteria for the selection of the proposed centers should be their ability to bring together public health scientists, environmental engineers, economists, and policy analysts to undertake intensive

cost-benefit analysis of various PM control strategies. This initiative is to complement, and be closely coordinated with, the base PM research program.

+ \$2,000,000 for the Water Environment Research Foundation cooperative research program.

+ \$3,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation.

+ \$1,750,000 to the National Jewish Medical and Research Center for research on the relationship between indoor and outdoor pollution and the development of respiratory diseases.

+ \$2,000,000 for the Lovelace Respiratory Institute to establish a National Environmental Respiratory Center to coordinate research and information transfer concerning health risks of breathing airborne contaminants in the environment.

+ \$1,000,000 for the Center for Air Toxic Metals at the Energy and Environmental Research Center.

+ \$1,000,000 for the Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies to identify and test new cost-effective environmental restoration technologies.

+ \$1,000,000 for the Institute for Environmental and Industrial Science to develop new technologies for controlling radioactive waste, solid waste, and other emissions.

+ \$2,500,000 for EPA's experimental program to stimulate competitive research [EPSCoR].

+ \$500,000 for the clean air status and trends network.

+ \$1,500,000 for Johns Hopkins University's School of Hygiene and Public Health to establish a National Center for Environmental Toxicology and Epidemiology. The center will advance the Nation's understanding of the effect of urban toxics on human health, and assist in designing cost-effective preventive strategies focused on mitigating their adverse health effects.

+ \$1,000,000 to establish the Center for Estuarine and Coastal Ocean Environmental Research to coordinate and further ongoing coastal and environmental research being conducted at the University of South Alabama.

+ \$1,500,000 for the Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium.

- \$5,000,000 from the climate change action plan program, leaving \$17,000,000 in this account for this program, an increase of 7 percent over the fiscal year 1997 level.

- \$7,000,000 from the increase requested for graduate academic fellowships, leaving \$8,000,000.

- \$8,000,000 from the new Environmental Monitoring for Public Access and Community Tracking Program, leaving \$7,000,000 for this new initiative.

- \$21,019,400 as a general reduction.

The amount provided for Superfund research includes \$6,000,000 for the Mine Waste Technology Evaluation Program and Berkeley pit integrated demonstration activities through the National Environmental Waste Technology Testing and Evaluation Center, full funding for the Hazardous Substance Research Center, \$2,500,000 for the Gulf Coast Hazardous Substance Research Center, and not less than \$7,000,000 for the Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation [SITE] Program. The Committee believes the SITE Program has been successful and there continues to be a significant need for innovative cleanup technologies. According to EPA's Science Advisory Board, the program's accomplishments have been impressive.

The Committee's recommendation includes full funding, \$36,000,000, for drinking water research, with priority given to research on microbial contamination.

With respect to the \$26,600,000 requested by the administration and recommended by the Committee for particulate matter research, EPA is directed to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to develop a research agenda to allocate these funds.

Although EPA will be issuing a revised standard for particulate matter, the Administrator has indicated that this standard will have no regulatory impact until after the next review which would occur in July 2002 under the requirements of the Clean Air Act. The Committee understands that substantial additional scientific information that would be useful in validating or revising the standard can be gathered through carefully directed scientific research before that date. Therefore, the Committee directs that the National Academy of Sciences convene an independent panel of scientists to provide recommendations for research priorities. The Administrator is to transmit the recommendations of this panel to Congress not later than February 1998 and be guided by the recommendations of the panel in selecting research projects to support with the appropriated funds. The Committee expects that this process would also allow comment by other interested parties, including appropriate Federal agencies and nongovernmental entities.

All particulate matter research activities are to be peer-reviewed, and should be appropriately balanced among extramural competitive grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to institutions of higher education, national and private sector laboratories, as well as intramural studies and contracts.

Finally, EPA is directed to report to the Committee on the specific plans for the PM research program as the program develops.

The Committee directs EPA to provide adequate resources to fund the university portion of the southern oxidants study on the formation of ozone pollution, its effects, and alternate strategies for its reduction.

The Committee continues to have concerns with the quality of research at EPA. Sound science should be the basis for EPA regulatory actions, and strong peer review procedures are a critical element of ensuring the best quality research. Within the last year the General Accounting Office found that EPA's implementation of the Agency's peer review policy was uneven. GAO found that in some cases peer review was not conducted at all, or aspects of the peer review policy were ignored. GAO found inadequate accountability and oversight to ensure that all work products which should be peer reviewed were, in fact, peer reviewed. GAO recommended that EPA ensure that staff and managers are educated as to (1) the need for and benefits of peer review, (2) what constitutes proper peer review practices, and (3) their peer review responsibilities; and that EPA expand the list of products nominated for peer review.

The Committee strongly supports GAO's recommendations and expects EPA will implement them. In response to GAO's report, the Deputy Administrator issued a memorandum to clarify and strengthen the peer review policy, which was a good first step. The Committee expects peer review will be a top priority within EPA and that mechanisms will be instituted to ensure that managers are held accountable for implementing the peer review policy. Within 90 days of enactment of this act, EPA is to submit a report addressing how it has responded to GAO's recommendations and the steps it has taken to ensure accountability for peer review policy implementation.

As part of its continuing interest in verification of cost-effective remediation technologies, the Committee is aware of the public-private sector effort in Hawaii to demonstrate and ultimately commercialize agriculturally based environmental remediation technologies. The diverse climatic and biologic conditions in this tropical state offer a range of verification and demonstration activities not possible in other parts of the United States. EPA should give strong consideration to funding a proposal by the Hawaii Institute of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources to address this innovative means of environmental restoration.

The Committee is aware of ground water remediation technology which has been developed by the International Research Center for Groundwater Research. This technology shows great potential to reduce the costs of ground water remediation significantly. EPA should consider testing this

technology through the environmental technology verification program.

The Committee urges EPA to give priority to the soil aquifer treatment research program for indirect potable reuse of highly treated domestic wastewater being conducted in California and Arizona.

The Committee notes that the use of site-specific or precision farming has tremendous potential to improve ground water quality by minimizing runoff of excess agricultural chemicals. Yet much of the data gathered by global positioning satellites for site-specific farming uses has not been verified at the field level. EPA is strongly encouraged through the advanced measurement initiative to obtain the necessary satellite data and undertake a demonstration project at North Dakota State University comparing such satellite data to field-gathered data from the Oakes irrigation test area in southeast North Dakota.

The Committee notes with interest the innovative approach to clean air research being developed by the city of Houston in its Houston air excellence and leadership [HAXL] program, which seeks to identify ways in which air pollution control policy can be targeted toward the precise pollutants that cause the most serious health impacts in a particular city or region. This unique, multipollutant strategy aims to maximize health benefits and cost efficiency by focusing on the specific needs of each particular area. The Committee notes that the Houston area suffers some of the most severe and complex air quality problems in the United States. EPA is urged to provide support to this innovative program.

The Committee has not included proposed bill language relative to the environmental services fund.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 1997	\$1,752,221,000
Budget estimate, 1998	1,887,590,900
Committee recommendation	1,801,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Agency's "Environmental programs and management" account includes the development of environmental standards; monitoring and surveillance of pollution conditions; direct Federal pollution control planning; technical assistance to pollution control agencies and organizations; preparation of environmental impact statements; compliance assurance; and assistance to Federal agencies in complying with environmental standards and insuring that their activities have minimal environmental impact.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,801,000,000 for environmental programs and management, an increase of \$48,779,000 above the 1997 level and a decrease of \$86,590,900 below the budget request.

The Committee has made the following changes from the budget request:

+ \$5,025,000 for rural water technical assistance activities, for a total of \$13,025,000, including \$7,900,000 for the National Rural Water Association; \$2,100,000 for the Rural Community Assistance Program; \$400,000 for the Groundwater Protection Council; \$75,000 for the National Groundwater Foundation; \$1,000,000 for the National Environmental Training Center; and \$1,550,000 for the small flows clearinghouse.

+ \$3,000,000 to continue the demonstration project involving leaking fuel tanks in rural Alaska villages.

+ \$250,000 for the Nature Conservancy of Alaska for protection of the Kenai River watershed.

+ \$1,250,000 to continue the onsite wastewater treatment demonstration program through the small flows clearinghouse, including efforts

initiated last year in flood-ravaged areas.

+\$3,000,000 for the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy.

+\$1,000,000 for the Sacramento River Toxic Pollutant Control Program.

+\$500,000 for the continuation of the small water system cooperative initiative at Montana State University.

+\$500,000 for a small public water system technology center at Western Kentucky University.

+\$2,000,000 for the New York City watershed protection program.

+\$750,000 for the Chesapeake Bay program to initiate a small watershed grants program for the implementation of cooperative tributary basic strategies that address the bay's water quality and living resource needs.

+\$1,000,000 for the national decentralized water resources public-private capacity development project.

+\$1,000,000 to continue the sediment decontamination technology in the New York-New Jersey harbor.

+\$500,000 for the Treasure Valley hydrologic project.

+\$2,500,000 for King County, WA, for a molten carbonate fuel cell demonstration project at the Renton wastewater treatment plant.

+\$800,000 for the National Center for Vehicle Emissions Control and Safety to establish an On-Board Diagnostic Research Center.

+\$500,000 to continue the Small Business Pollution Prevention Center at the University of Northern Iowa.

+\$500,000 to continue the Compliance Assistance Center for Painting and Coating Technology.

+\$200,000 to complete the cleanup of Five Island Lake.

+\$500,000 for the Ala Wai Canal watershed improvement project.

+\$400,000 to continue the Maui algal bloom project.

+\$100,000 for the Design for the Environment for Farmers Program to address the unique environmental concerns of the American Pacific and the need to develop and adopt sustainable agricultural practices for these fragile tropical ecosystems.

+\$1,500,000 for the Lake Champlain management plan.

+\$600,000 for the final year of funding for the solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstration in Burlington, VT, to be cost-shared

by the participants. The Committee does not intend to recommend funding for additional solar aquatic wastewater treatment demonstrations in view of EPA's assessment that this technology does not appear to offer any economic advantages over conventional technologies.

+ \$1,000,000 for the Alabama Department of Environmental Management to coordinate a model water/wastewater operating training program. This program will not duplicate, but will build upon and coordinate with other similar technical assistance programs.

+ \$150,000 to establish a regional training center at the Kentucky Onsite Wastewater Center.

+ \$550,000 for the Idaho water initiative.

+ \$1,000,000 for Lake Weequahic cleanup efforts.

+ \$1,750,000 for the Three Rivers watershed protection demonstration project, to develop an overall master plan to eliminate more than 40 separate sanitary sewer overflows in the Three Rivers area of Allegheny County, PA.

+ \$750,000 to continue the Resource and Agricultural Policy Systems Program.

+ \$1,250,000 for the design of an innovative granular activated carbon water treatment project in Oahu.

+ \$500,000 for a small public water system technology center at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

+ \$2,000,000 for the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute's Missouri Watershed initiative project to link economic and environmental data with ambient water quality.

+ \$1,500,000 for the National Alternative Fuels Training Program.

+ \$500,000 for a study of dioxin levels in the Ohio River Basin.

+ \$300,000 for the California Urban Environmental Research and Education Center.

+ \$1,000,000 to continue the implementation of a wetlands-based potable water reuse program for the city of West Palm Beach.

+ \$700,000 for the Long Island Sound office.

+ \$2,000,000 for the University of Missouri Agroforestry Center to support the agroforestry floodplain initiative. The Committee understands that this is a partnership effort to develop and apply appropriate agroforestry systems to resist and mitigate the impacts of nonpoint source pollution and flooding on lands in the Mississippi and Missouri River basins.

+\$300,000 for the Northeast States for coordinated air use management.

-\$10,000,000 from the increase requested for sustainable development challenge grants, leaving \$5,000,000 for this program.

-\$9,000,000 from the Montreal Protocol Facilitation Fund, leaving \$12,000,000.

-\$52,300,000 from the climate change action plan, leaving \$75,000,000 for this program, an increase of 7 percent above fiscal year 1997. The Committee notes that in a recent report, the General Accounting Office raised questions as to the accuracy of the reported reductions associated with certain of the climate change action plan programs, including the Green Lights Program. With respect to Green Lights, GAO found that the projected reductions are based on an assumption that the participants will upgrade a larger proportion of their space than they have thus far. The Committee continues to believe these programs do not merit the significant increases requested by the administration and that the outcomes of these programs to date have fallen very short of agency goals. In addition, a report conducted by Resources for the Future on voluntary programs intended to reduce pollution found that such Federal programs ``do not address most of the important problems with the pollution control system nor do they appear to contribute significantly to improving environmental quality or safety."

-\$10,000,000 from the new environmental monitoring for public access and community tracking program.

-\$2,000,000 from rental costs, to reflect latest agency estimates.

-\$1,000,000 from GLOBE.

-\$44,915,900 as a general reduction.

The Committee continues to support all efforts to implement recommendations contained in the National Academy of Public Administration's 1995 report, ``Setting Priorities, Getting Results: A New Direction for EPA." While supportive of EPA's new planning, budgeting, and accountability system--which was put in place to meet NAPA's recommendations as well as the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA]--the Committee is concerned that EPA's fiscal year 1998 budget submission did not seem to reflect a new disciplined budget system. Further, much remains to be done to develop a meaningful, performance-oriented system of planning, budgeting, and accountability for agency programs and activities. In addition, at present there are many concerns with EPA's draft strategic plan as it relates to GPRA requirements.

According to the General Accounting Office, "EPA faces long-term challenges to obtain the scientific and environmental information needed to support its new system fully. Although much scientific and environmental information has already been collected, many gaps exist, and the data are often difficult to compile because different data collection methods have been used. Likewise, much effort is still needed to identify, develop, and reach agreement on a comprehensive set of environmental measures to link the agency's activities to changes in human health and environmental conditions." EPA has tried previously to implement a planning, budgeting, and accountability system--without success. It is expected that EPA will afford a high priority to addressing these complex issues. EPA is directed to submit a report to the Committee within 90 days of enactment of this act, outlining its strategy, benchmarks, and timeline for addressing the system's current shortcomings as described by GAO.

The Committee notes that NAPA will soon be releasing its evaluation of the steps EPA has taken to implement the NAPA recommendations. The Committee will give close attention to this evaluation and to the agency's response, especially concerning the recent reorganization of agency planning and budgeting functions, reorganization of responsibilities for environmental statistics, and progress in providing regulatory and management flexibility that facilitate improved environmental performance. The Committee also directed the agency to begin work on draft legislation that would integrate its various statutory responsibilities. The Committee looks forward to receiving the Academy's recommendations and those of the agency on this important issue.

The Committee is concerned with the proliferation of new initiatives at EPA over the past several years, which makes it increasingly difficult to focus on the highest priority areas. The Committee concurs with recommendations contained in an EPA management review that EPA should develop goals and objectives for agency initiatives and define measures of success for tracking progress. Any new initiatives should be considered through a risk-based planning, budgeting, and accountability system which affords as the highest priorities those activities offering the largest opportunity to reduce risk to human health and the environment.

The Committee is disappointed with EPA's recent decision to create a new Center for Environmental Information and Statistics within the Office of Policy, Planning, and Evaluation. NAPA recommended the creation of an independent office for environmental information and statistics to ensure that it be a neutral and credible data source. EPA's decision to place a center within OPPE is inconsistent with NAPA's

recommendation. The Committee believes EPA should place the new Center for Environmental Information and Statistics directly and solely under the chief information officer to integrate and improve the quality of environmental statistics provided by the agency's various information systems and to be an authoritative source, independent of policy and regulatory activities, of credible statistics about environmental conditions.

The Committee continues to support a true partnership between EPA and the States in implementing the Nation's environmental management system. There are serious concerns with various actions taken by EPA recently which would suggest that EPA is not willing to recognize the States fully as partners. Since most of the implementation and enforcement of environmental programs occurs at the State level, the Committee expects EPA leadership will take decisive steps to devolve responsibility to the States, reduce oversight, provide flexibility, and treat States as equal partners.

The Committee believes EPA should play a stronger role in enhancing opportunities for industry to export environmental technologies to other countries. The Committee urges EPA to develop a strategy to coordinate and promote the export of environmental technology and services and coordinate such efforts with other Federal agencies. The Committee intends to track EPA's activities on this front.

The Committee is aware that EPA is in the process of dramatically expanding access to information it has collected across many of its program offices. The Agency is achieving this goal by enhancing its information systems to communicate information using computer networks, such as the Internet. These networks have provided EPA with an easy means of placing very large quantities of data into readily accessible open-source public data bases. The Committee recognizes that increased access to regulatory information can promote public awareness regarding the Nation's economy and environmental conditions. A more informed public may also be in a better position to evaluate Government programs. However, public data bases can be subject to abuses which could facilitate economic espionage, thereby eroding U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace. To obtain a better understanding of how individual data elements can be collected from multiple data bases, in a way that allows foreign competitors to successfully reverse engineer technologies and processes that would otherwise provide a competitive advantage to U.S. firms, the Committee directs GAO to undertake a study to:

- (1) Assess the extent to which EPA currently makes accessible (and plans to make accessible) to the public, information that is valuable to competitive intelligence agents who conduct reverse engineering or other

means of economic espionage;

(2) Identify the types of data that are of greatest value to competitive intelligence agents, and identify EPA's public data bases, if any, that contain these type of data;

(3) Describe the processes employed by competitive intelligence agents who compile open-source data for competitive profiling, and estimate the costs associated with these processes;

(4) Evaluate the threat to U.S. competitiveness, if any, posed by EPA's current and proposed public data bases;

(5) Identify the scope of EPA's current protections of sensitive business information, and assess the adequacy of those protections; and

(6) Recommend options for preventing the loss of sensitive economic and proprietary information of U.S. businesses through EPA's public data bases.

The Committee is aware of a unique proposal developed by Fort Scott, KS, for providing additional tertiary wastewater treatment via a constructed wetland which will improve the quality of the Marmaton River. EPA is directed to consider strongly funding such a proposal under section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act.

The Committee strongly encourages EPA to promulgate the Cluster Rule for the pulp and paper industry. The pulp and paper industry has waited almost 4 years for this rule to be issued. The need for this rule is clear. Further delay will harm the environment and prevent industry from proceeding with capital planning.

The Committee urges EPA to form a citizens advisory council to address current waste removal plans as well as long-term plans for the Dalecarlia Treatment Plant.

The Committee urges EPA to give careful consideration to the establishment of a Small Public Water Systems Technology Assistance Center at West Virginia University and at the University of New Hampshire pursuant to provision of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments.

The Committee is aware that the Lake Champlain Basin Program has begun a sister lake partnership with Lake Orchid in the former Soviet Union. This initiative shows great promise and the Committee urges EPA to look to it as a model for its own program.

The Committee supports the full budget request for south Florida (Everglades) restoration activities (with the exception of opening a new EPA office in south Florida), the National Estuary Program, the Chesapeake Bay Program including a new air deposition initiative, and the Great Lakes national program office.

Within the National Estuary Program adequate funding should be provided to Sarasota Bay, Buzzards Bay, and Massachusetts Bay. The

Committee directs EPA to fund the following programs at no less than current levels: the environmental finance centers, the water quality testing program along the New Jersey and New York shorelines, the Great Waters Program, and the Environmental Research Laboratory.

The Committee is concerned that EPA may not be adhering carefully to the Environmental Programs Assistance Act with respect to making grants or cooperative agreements to utilize the talents of older Americans in providing technical assistance. The Committee urges EPA to make grants to and enter into cooperative agreements with organizations under the Environmental Programs Assistance Act if such organizations are designated by the Department of Labor under title V of the Older Americans Act. The Committee notes that Green Thumb, Inc., has an exemplary record of success under title V of the Older Americans Act.

The Committee notes the urgent problems associated with zebra mussel infestation in Lake Champlain, which threatens the water systems of 25 percent of Vermont's residents. EPA is urged to provide support to exploring new ways to control zebra mussels in Lake Champlain.

EPA is urged to provide assistance to the city of Gainesville, FL, for an innovative stormwater management project to protect the Floridian aquifer from stormwater runoff.

The Committee recognizes the special rigors imposed on residents of the Northwest Arctic Borough by harsh arctic environmental conditions and the lack of sanitation facilities. EPA is directed to conduct a feasibility study, in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers, for a potential pilot project demonstrating innovative alternatives to the existing haul-water drinking water and honey bucket human waste disposal systems, in consultation with the Public Health Service and the Indian Health Service.

The Committee is concerned that permitting for new oil and gas projects in Alaska not be delayed and that permits for these projects be processed in a timely and expeditious fashion. Given the importance of these new developments to the State of Alaska and the Nation, the Committee expects that the budget request accounts for the projected increased demand on permitting resources. Should the agency not be able to meet permit time lines for new developments in a timely and expeditious fashion, the Committee expects to receive from the agency a report and, if necessary, a reprogramming request to make necessary funds available to meet timely permit processing milestones.

The Committee is aware that the EPA continues to suggest that emissions from distilled spirits aging warehouses must be regulated under the Clean Air Act. The aging of distilled spirits is a natural process by which distilled spirit products derive their inherent characteristics, including color, taste, and aroma. Altering this aging

process by imposing emission control technology on aging warehouses would inflict an unreasonable adverse effect on the maturation process for these products and thereby jeopardize the desired quality and uniqueness of each distilled spirits brand. Therefore, the Committee directs EPA to reevaluate their present position and work with the distilled spirits industry to assure that the quality of their products is not jeopardized because of unnecessary regulation and lack of flexibility on the part of the Agency.

The Committee notes that the Coordinated Tribal Water Quality Program in Washington is a model for demonstrating how tribes can solve their water quality protection problems by coordinating with local, State, and Federal Government agencies. EPA is strongly urged to continue providing assistance to this model program.

The Committee urges EPA to continue to support within available funds the Sokaogon Chippewa community's efforts to assess the environmental impacts of a proposed sulfide mine project and contribute adequate and up-to-date information to Federal agencies reviewing the mine proposal.

The Committee has not included proposed bill language relative to the environmental services fund.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(including transfer of funds)

Appropriations, 1997	\$28,500,000
Budget estimate, 1998	28,500,000
Committee recommendation	28,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Inspector General provides EPA audit and investigative functions to identify and recommend corrective actions of management, program, and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste, and mismanagement.

Trust fund resources are transferred to this account directly from the hazardous substance Superfund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$40,141,000 for the Office of Inspector General, the same as the budget request. The appropriation includes \$28,500,000 from the general fund in this account and \$11,641,000 from the Superfund trust fund. The trust fund resources will be transferred to the inspector general ``General fund" account with an expenditure transfer.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1997	\$87,220,000
Budget estimate, 1998	141,420,000
Committee recommendation	19,420,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The appropriation for buildings and facilities at EPA covers the necessary major repairs and improvements to existing installations which are used by the Agency. This appropriation also covers new construction projects when appropriate.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$19,420,000 for buildings and facilities. The decrease of \$122,000,000 below the request reflects the Committee's recommendation not to provide additional funds for the new Research Triangle Park [RTP] laboratory project at this time.

The Committee notes there are significant space and safety concerns associated with EPA's Edison Laboratory, which houses the national headquarters of the environmental response team as well as supporting EPA's region II routine analytic requirements. EPA is directed to assess whether this facility should be replaced, based on an overall assessment of EPA laboratory facility requirements nationwide and cost-benefit analyses of maintaining, replacing, or consolidating facilities. If appropriate, EPA should propose funding for this project in the fiscal year 1999 budget submission.

The Committee is aware of and interested in a recent proposal to construct a solid oxide fuel cell/gas turbine power system demonstration plant at EPA's new Fort Meade research facility. Such systems show great promise in producing and providing efficient, low polluting power resources. The Committee would, therefore, entertain a future budget

request by the Agency to construct such a facility.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(including transfer of funds)

Appropriations, 1997	\$1,394,245,000
Budget estimate, 1998	2,094,245,000
Committee recommendation	1,400,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

On October 17, 1986, Congress amended the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 [CERCLA] through the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 [SARA]. SARA reauthorized and expanded the hazardous substance Superfund to address the problems of uncontrolled hazardous waste sites and spills. Specifically, the legislation mandates that EPA: (1) provide emergency response to hazardous waste spills; (2) take emergency action at hazardous waste sites that pose an imminent hazard to public health or environmentally sensitive ecosystems; (3) engage in long-term planning, remedial design, and construction to clean up hazardous waste sites where no financially viable responsible party can be found; (4) take enforcement actions to require responsible private and Federal parties to clean up hazardous waste sites; and (5) take enforcement actions to recover costs where the fund has been used for cleanup.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,400,000,000 for Superfund. This represents an increase of \$5,755,000 above the current budget. The amount provided includes \$250,000,000 from general revenues, as authorized, and the balance from the trust fund.

The amount recommended includes the following:

--\$903,000,000 for the response program. This includes the President's full request for brownfields.

--\$174,000,000 for enforcement.

--\$35,000,000 for research and development.

--\$125,000,000 for management and support.

--\$68,000,000 for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, including \$2,500,000 for the Great Lakes fish consumption study. In addition, ATSDR should provide adequate funds to continue the Dover Township, NJ, cancer cluster studies.

--\$55,500,000 for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, including \$23,000,000 for worker training grants and \$32,500,000 for research.

--\$39,500,000 for other Federal agencies.

The amount provided is the same as that originally projected for fiscal year 1998 in the President's fiscal year 1997 budget. No sound explanation has been provided as to why this program became the administration's highest EPA priority for fiscal year 1998 and merits a 50-percent increase in funding. It has generally been recognized that funds invested in this program yield relatively little reduction in risk to human health and the environment compared to investments targeted at addressing other environmental problems.

The Committee has numerous concerns with the Superfund budget request in addition to the fact that on a risk continuum, the program ranks relatively low. First, there are many questions with whether EPA could allocate effectively and appropriately the 50-percent increase it has requested. The Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials stated: "We don't know whether there is enough pending work for the full \$700,000,000 in additional funds requested in fiscal year 1998, nor that the infrastructure exists to spend it effectively." Indeed, EPA's budget request for Superfund was premised on a resource methodology--not actual site data--which was developed to support a goal of achieving 900 site completions by the year 2000. The methodology uses inflated pricing factors, according to Congressional Budget Office analysis, and has other significant flaws raising serious questions about its usefulness.

The Committee is also troubled by recent findings of the General Accounting Office relative to Superfund administrative reforms. GAO found that EPA has not yet demonstrated accomplishments for most reforms despite EPA's claims that the reforms have resulted in significant, fundamental and demonstrable changes in the program. GAO also found that the implementation of the administrative reforms was inconsistent.

GAO has also reported that approximately \$250,000,000 is available in unspent obligated funds in the Superfund Program to be recovered from

over 6,000 completed work orders and assistance agreements. EPA is directed to provide necessary resources and incentives to enhance its deobligation efforts, so as to increase resources available for site cleanups.

While the Committee is supportive of the goal of accelerating site cleanups and completion rates, it cannot support a major funding hike in the Superfund Program prior to the enactment of reauthorization legislation and the correction of serious program deficiencies which have lead to the General Accounting Office's designation of Superfund as a high risk program. The chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee has stated that: "It would be unwise and irresponsible for Congress to appropriate significantly increased funding for Superfund until we complete the task of reauthorization and can be sure that the money will be used to accelerate the pace of cleanup and protect our citizens." The Committee concurs with this recommendation. Upon enactment of legislation reauthorizing Superfund, the Committee will promptly consider increasing funds for this program.

The Committee expects EPA will continue using a risk-based approach to allocating funds within this program, ensuring those sites posing the most significant threats to human health and the environment are addressed first and as expeditiously as possible. EPA is directed to provide its risk-based ranking of remedial and removal actions within 30 days of enactment of this act.

The Committee has included bill language delaying the availability of \$100,000,000 until September 1, 1998. This language was included in the fiscal year 1997 Superfund appropriation and is not anticipated to have a programmatic impact.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

(including transfer of funds)

Appropriations, 1997	\$60,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	71,210,700
Committee recommendation	65,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorizations Act of 1986 [SARA] established the leaking underground storage tank [LUST] trust fund to conduct corrective actions for releases from leaking underground storage tanks containing petroleum and other hazardous substances. EPA implements the LUST program through State cooperative agreement grants which enable States to conduct corrective actions to protect human health and the environment, and through non-State entities including Indian tribes under section 8001 of RCRA. The trust fund is also used to enforce responsible parties to finance corrective actions and to recover expended funds used to clean up abandoned tanks.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a budget of \$65,000,000 for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the 1997 enacted level.

The Committee has recommended an increase for this program in view of the December 1998 deadline for compliance with underground storage tank upgrade requirements, and the attendant increase in enforcement and other responsibilities on the part of the States. This program has resulted in important environmental progress in cleaning up leaking underground storage tanks, one of the major sources of ground water contamination. The Committee directs that not less than 85 percent of the funds provided be allocated to the States.

The Committee opposes suggestions by EPA to utilize LUST fund moneys for other EPA programs such as the Underground Storage Tank Program, Underground Injection Control Program, and the Groundwater Protection Program, unless there is prior authorization for such use. While protecting the Nation's ground water supplies from contamination is vitally important, it is not appropriate to tap the LUST trust fund for the purposes proposed. Given the approaching compliance deadlines and the need for greater State assistance, it is the intent of the Committee to make every effort to give States the maximum amount of money possible for this program.

The Committee recommends bill language which limits administrative expenses to \$7,500,000.

OILSPILL RESPONSE

(including transfer of funds)

Appropriations, 1997	\$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1987 and amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds for preventing and responding to releases of oil and other petroleum products in navigable waterways. EPA is responsible for: directing all cleanup and removal activities posing a threat to public health and the environment; conducting inspections, including compelling responsible parties to undertake cleanup actions; reviewing containment plans at facilities; reviewing area contingency plans; pursuing cost recovery of fund-financed cleanups; and conducting research of oil cleanup techniques. Funds are provided through the oilspill liability trust fund established by the Oil Pollution Act and managed by the Coast Guard.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$15,000,000 for the oilspill response trust fund, the same as the budget request and the current level. The Committee included bill language limiting administrative expenses to \$8,500,000.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 1997	\$2,910,207,000
Budget estimate, 1998	2,793,257,000
Committee recommendation	3,047,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The ``State and tribal assistance grants" account funds grants to support the State revolving fund programs; State, tribal, regional, and local environmental programs; and special projects to address critical water and waste water treatment needs.

This account funds the following infrastructure grant programs: State revolving funds; United States-Mexico Border Program; colonias projects; and Alaska Native villages.

It also contains the following environmental grants, State/tribal program grants, and assistance and capacity building grants: (1) Nonpoint source (sec. 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act); (2) water quality cooperative agreements (sec. 104(b)(3) of FWPCA); (3) public water system supervision; (4) air resource assistance to State, local, and tribal governments (sec. 105 of the Clean Air Act); (5) radon State grants; (6) water pollution control agency resource supplementation (sec. 106 of the FWPCA); (7) wetlands program implementation; (8) underground injection control; (9) Pesticides Program implementation; (10) lead grants; (11) hazardous waste financial assistance; (12) pesticides enforcement grants; (13) pollution prevention; (14) toxic substances enforcement grants; (15) Indians general assistance grants; and, (16) underground storage tanks. The funds provided in this account, exclusive of the funds for the SRF and the special water and waste water treatment projects, may be used by the Agency to enter into performance partnerships with States and tribes rather than media-specific categorical program grants, if requested by the States and tribes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,047,000,000 for State and tribal assistance grants, an increase of \$253,743,000 over the budget request and \$136,793,000 over the enacted level. The Committee's recommendation includes the following:

--\$725,000,000 for performance partnership/categorical grants and associated program support. The increase of \$10,000,000 over the request is to be allocated for air grants in view of the critical and increasing responsibilities of State air quality agencies, including monitoring for fine particles and data collection activities. Funding for these activities should be awarded under section 103 of the Clean Air Act.

--\$725,000,000, the budget request, for drinking water State revolving funds.

--\$1,350,000,000 for clean water State revolving funds, an increase of \$275,000,000 above the budget request.

--\$150,000,000 for water and wastewater projects on the United States-Mexico border, including \$50,000,000 for colonias in Texas. Funds for the colonias shall be matched by State funds from State resources at 20 percent of the Federal appropriation.

--\$15,000,000 for rural and Alaskan Native villages to address the special water and wastewater treatment needs of thousands of households that lack basic sanitation.

--\$82,000,000 for special needs infrastructure grants, as follows:

--\$7,000,000 for wastewater facility and sanitary system improvements in Burlington, IA.

--\$7,150,000 for export pipeline replacement for protection of Lake Tahoe, CA.

--\$5,000,000 to implement combined sewer overflow [CSO] projects in Richmond (\$2,500,000) and Lynchburg, VA, (\$2,500,000).

--\$7,000,000 for the Ashley Valley, UT, sewer management board for wastewater improvements.

--\$1,000,000 to rehabilitate water and sewer systems in Ogden, UT.

--\$4,000,000 for Jackson County, MS, water supply system improvements.

--\$50,000 for water and sewer improvements for the city of Kinloch, MO.

--\$1,200,000 for water and wastewater improvements in the areas of east Mesa and west Mesa in Las Cruces, NM.

--\$5,000,000 for water system improvements in the Virgin Valley Water District, NV.

--\$2,000,000 for the town of Epping, NH, for wastewater treatment upgrades.

--\$4,300,000 for wastewater improvements in Queen Annes County, MD, (\$2,300,000) and biological nutrient removal of sewage on the Pocomoke River, MD, (\$2,000,000).

--\$6,000,000 for water/wastewater improvements in the

Moreland/Riverside area of Bingham County (\$3,000,000); the city of Rupert (\$2,000,000); and the Rosewell and Homedale areas (\$1,000,000) of Idaho.

--\$5,000,000 for Missoula, MT, sewer system improvements.

--\$1,700,000 for Essex County, MA, water/sewer improvements.

--\$3,000,000 for the Milton, VT, wastewater treatment plant project.

--\$5,000,000 for sewage infrastructure improvements for Connellsville and Bullskin Townships in Fayette, PA, (\$2,500,000) and Fallowfield Township, PA, (\$2,500,000).

--\$6,300,000 for wastewater treatment improvements in Pulaski County (\$5,000,000) and Kingdom City (\$1,300,000), MO.

--\$8,000,000 for the Upper Savannah Council of Governments for wastewater facility improvements for the Savannah Valley regional sewer project in Abbeville, McCormick, and Edgefield Counties, SC.

--\$3,300,000 for water system improvements in Jackson County (\$800,000), Washington County (\$2,000,000), and Cleburne County (\$500,000), AL.

EPA is to work with the grant recipients on appropriate cost-share arrangements consistent with past practice.

The Committee notes that the amounts provided for the drinking water State revolving funds are available for national set-asides outlined in section 1452; however, health effects research is funded in the ``Science and technology" account as proposed by the Administration.

The Committee recognizes the continuing importance of addressing the substandard health conditions of 350,000 legal residents of colonias, border-region rural subdivisions that lack adequate drinking water and wastewater service. In order to continue ongoing efforts to meet the residents' needs, \$50,000,000 is recommended for grants to the State of Texas, which shall be matched by State funds from State resources at 20 percent of the Federal appropriation. The match requirement may be fulfilled through the commitment of State funds for either loans or grants for construction of wastewater or water systems serving colonias and the match may also consist of payment on bond interest associated with loans or grants for construction of wastewater and water systems. These terms of the match requirement shall also apply to all prior appropriated funds for colonias.

The Committee understands that the primary environmental and public health problem in the El Paso, TX, region is the rapid depletion of the ground water aquifer because of a lack of year-round surface water supply. El Paso, in concert with the Texas-New Mexico Water Commission

and in conjunction with Mexico, is working to resolve this problem. To support this effort, the Committee urges that \$3,000,000 from the border infrastructure fund be allocated to El Paso for use in its Rio Grande environmental monitoring program and \$2,000,000 be allocated for the Federal share for construction of the Jonathan Rogers plant.

The Committee has included bill language allowing States to cross-collateralize their clean water and drinking water State revolving funds. This language makes explicit that funds appropriated to the SRF's may be used as common security in a bond issue for both SRF's, ensuring maximum opportunity for leveraging these funds.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The Committee has included bill language, as proposed by the administration, which makes permanent EPA's working capital fund authority to institutionalize fee-for-service as the mechanism to fund certain administrative services and strengthen customer office accountability for administrative support in carrying out the agency's mission.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Science and Technology Policy

Appropriations, 1997	\$4,932,000
Budget estimate, 1998	4,932,000
Committee recommendation	4,932,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Science and Technology Policy [OSTP] was created by the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (Public Law 94 238) and coordinates science and technology policy for the White House. OSTP provides authoritative scientific and technological information, analysis, and advice for the President, for the executive branch, and for Congress; participates in formulation, coordination, and implementation of national and international policies and programs that involve science and technology; maintains and promotes the health and vitality of the U.S. science and technology infrastructure; and coordinates research and development efforts of the

Federal Government to maximize the return on the public's investment in science and technology and to ensure Federal resources are used efficiently and appropriately.

OSTP provides support for the National Science and Technology Council [NSTC].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,932,000 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy. This amount is the same as the budget request and the current level.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Appropriations, 1997	\$2,436,000
Budget estimate, 1998	3,020,000
Committee recommendation	2,436,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Council on Environmental Quality/Office of Environmental Quality was established by the National Environmental Policy Act and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970. The Council serves as a source of environmental expertise and policy analysis for the White House, Executive Office of the President agencies, and other Federal agencies. CEQ promulgates regulations binding on all Federal agencies to implement the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and resolves interagency environmental disputes informally and through issuance of findings and recommendations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has provided \$2,436,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality, the same as the current level.

The Committee has not included proposed bill language regarding the number of CEQ council members. This matter should be addressed by the authorizing committee.

TITLE IV--GENERAL PROVISIONS (Excerpts)

The Committee recommends inclusion of 21 general provisions previously enacted in the 1997 appropriations act. They are standard limitations which have been carried in the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill in the past.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE

SENATE

Paragraph 7 of Rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill ``which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

.....

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Environmental programs and management: \$1,805,000,000.

Science and technology: \$600,000,000.

Buildings and facilities: \$19,420,000.

State and tribal assistance grants: \$3,030,000,000.

Superfund: \$1,400,000,000.

.....

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE

SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any

statute include ``(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

As discussed earlier in this report, the dramatic and unprecedented constraints on domestic discretionary spending has made necessary inclusion of a considerable volume of legislative reforms and other changes in existing statutes in the Committee recommendation. This is particularly in evidence in title II, the Department of Housing and Urban Development portion of this bill, in which cost-saving and cost-avoidance measures for discretionary housing and community development activities require modification of programs governed a large body of detailed and complex statutory provisions.

The Committee has included substantial explanatory material in this report which attempts to fully detail both the intent and practical effect of these statutory provisions. In view of the extensive nature of these changes, however, preparation of a comparative print detailing each of these statutory amendments would delay prompt availability of this report. In the opinion of the Committee, it is necessary to dispense with the requirements of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI to expedite the business of the Senate.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 AND BUDGET
ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Item	1997 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -) 1997 appropriation Budget estimate	
Environmental Protection Agency					
Science and Technology	552,000,000	614,269,400	600,000,000	+48,000,000	-14,269,400
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Science and Technology	587,000,000	654,025,300	635,000,000	+48,000,000	-19,025,300
Environmental Programs and Management	1,752,221,000	1,887,590,900	1,801,000,000	+48,779,000	-86,590,900
Office of Inspector General	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000		
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, OIG	40,077,000	40,141,300	40,141,000	+64,000	-300
Buildings and facilities	87,220,000	141,420,000	19,420,000	-67,800,000	-122,000,000
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,294,245,000	2,094,245,000	1,300,000,000	+5,755,000	-794,245,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,348,245,000	2,042,847,800	1,353,359,000	+5,114,000	-689,488,800
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	60,000,000	71,210,700	65,000,000	+5,000,000	-6,210,700
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, LUST	59,423,000	71,210,700	65,000,000	+5,577,000	-6,210,700
Oil spill response	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000		
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,236,000,000	2,078,000,000	2,322,000,000	+86,000,000	+244,000,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, STAG	2,910,207,000	2,793,257,000	3,047,000,000	+136,793,000	+253,743,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, EPA	6,799,393,000	7,645,493,000	6,975,920,000	+176,527,000	-669,573,000